Application No.: 10/825,564 Attorney Docket No.: 09334.0008-00

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the following remarks. Claims 1-20 are currently pending in this application, of which claims 1 and 11 are independent. In the Office Action dated May 30, 2007, the Examiner rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0114778 ("Branson").

In response, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 11 to more particularly define the claimed invention. No new subject matter has been added. Support for the amendments may be found, for example, at page 19, paragraph [076]. Applicants submit that amended independent claims 1 and 11 and their dependent claims 2-10 and 12-20 are allowable over *Branson* under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

More specifically, amended claims 1 and 11 each recite at least "alert[ing] the user to the event, wherein the event is associated with both structured information accessible through a database and unstructured information that is stored in one or more file formats," and "receiv[ing] a first request for the structured database information relating to the event." *Branson* fails to show or suggest the above limitations. As the Examiner pointed out, *Branson* provides hover assistance on a computer screen "when the mouse pointer is over a graphical element." The hover assistance takes the form of a textbox 230 that identifies the graphic element. Office Action, page 2. Nowhere in *Branson* is it shown or suggested that the alerted event is "associated with both structured information accessible through a database and unstructured information that is stored in one or more file formats" and that a specific request "for the structured database information relating to the event" is received from the user. Therefore, at least

Application No.: 10/825,564

Attorney Docket No.: 09334.0008-00

because Branson fails to show or suggest every limitation of amended independent claims 1 and 11, claims 1 and 11 are not anticipated by Branson under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). Dependent claims 2-10 and 12-20 depend from claims 1 and 11, respective, and are, therefore, also allowable over Branson under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants submit that this claimed invention, as amended, is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of the prior art references cited against this application. Applicants therefore request the Examiner's reconsideration and reexamination of the application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our Deposit Account 06-0916.

By:

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: August 10, 2007

Cathy C. Ding Reg. No. 52,820